

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation that the Examiner has indicated that claims 5-6, and 15-16 are allowable.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 5-6 and 15-16 will be pending. By this amendment, claims 5 and 15 have been amended, and claims 1-4, 7-14, and 17-38 have been canceled.

§103 Rejections of Claims 1-4, 7-14, and 17-38

In Section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 11-12, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu et al (U.S. Patent 5,572,733; hereinafter referred to as “Ryu”) in view of Wold et al (U.S. Patent 5,386,568; hereinafter referred to as “Wold”) and further in view of Asthana et al (U.S. Patent 5,740,384; hereinafter referred to as “Asthana”).

In Section 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 3-4, 7-10, 13-14, and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu in view of Wold in view of Asthana and further in view of Kavner (U.S. Patent 6,430,607 B1; hereinafter referred to as “Kavner”).

In Section 24 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 22-36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu in view of Kavner. It appears that this rejection is actually of claims 22-25.

In Section 31 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 26-36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu in view of Wold in view of Asthana and further in view of Kavner.

In Section 33 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 37 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu in view of Wold in view of Asthana, and further in view of Marc H. Brown ("Distributed Active Object"; hereinafter referred to as "Brown").

As shown above, claims 1-4, 7-14, and 17-38 have been canceled, thereby obviating the rejections thereof. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these rejections be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

In Section 38 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to claims 5-6, and 15-16 as being dependent on a rejected base claim.

Claim 5 has been rewritten to include the limitations of claim 1 (base claim) and claims 3 and 4 (intervening claims). Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 5 is in condition for allowance. Claim 6 depends from claim 5 and so is also in condition in allowance.

Claim 15 has been rewritten to include the limitations of claim 11 (base claim) and claims 13 and 14 (intervening claims). Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 15 is in condition for allowance. Claim 16 depends from claim 5 and so is also in condition in allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, entry of this amendment, and the allowance of this application with claims 5-6 and 15-16 is respectfully solicited.

In regard to the claims amended herein and throughout the prosecution of this application, it is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.


In the event that additional cooperation in this case may be helpful to complete its prosecution, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number written below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:



Hans R. Mahr, Reg. No. 46,138 for
William S. Frommer
Reg. No. 25,506
(212) 588-0800